

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-16 are pending. Claims 1-3 and 9-11 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced. Applicants believe the claims comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venkatesh et al. (US 6,397,292) in view of Luke et al. (US 2004/0133634A1). The Examiner recognizes that Venkatesh et al. does not disclose at least one IP address set for the channel control portions to provide NAS service to the information processors, and cites Luke et al. for allegedly providing the missing teaching.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 9 as amended are novel and patentable over Venkatesh et al. and Luke et al. because, for instance, they do not teach or suggest deciding that data regarding at least one IP address set for the channel control portions to provide NAS service to the information processors are stored in a shared volume which is a storage region logically set on physical storage regions provided by the storage devices and which can be accessed commonly by any other channel control portion belonging to the same group to carry out fail-over. They further fail to teach or suggest that a successor channel control portion belonging to the same group as a predecessor channel control portion takes over the IP address of the predecessor channel control portion to receive data that have been previously received by the predecessor channel control portion prior to failure thereof.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 2 and 10 as amended are novel and patentable over Venkatesh et al. and Luke et al. because, for instance, they do not teach or suggest deciding that data regarding at least one IP address set for the channel control portions to provide NAS service to the information processors are stored in a shared memory which is contained in the storage device controller and which can be accessed commonly by the channel control portions to carry out fail-over. They further fail to teach or suggest that a successor channel control portion takes over the IP address of a predecessor channel control portion to receive data that have been previously received by the predecessor channel control portion prior to failure thereof.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 3 and 11 as amended are novel and patentable over Venkatesh et al. and Luke et al. because, for instance, they do not teach or suggest sending data regarding at least one IP address set for the channel control portions to provide NAS service to the information processors to another channel control portion belonging to the same group, through a network connecting the channel control portions to one another, to carry out fail-over. They further fail to teach or suggest that another channel control portion belonging to the same group as a predecessor channel control portion takes over the IP address of the predecessor channel control portion to receive data that have been previously received by the predecessor channel control portion prior to failure thereof.

Venkatesh discloses a data processing system including a storage controller having two channel adapters 41-42, two disk adapters 43-44, and a shared memory 47 (see Fig. 1). As shown in the flowchart of programming of the storage controller for accessing the disk arrays in Fig. 9, write data or read data is stored in the shared memory 47. Venkatesh fails to disclose to store data regarding at least one IP address set for the channel control portions to provide NAS service to the information processors, to carry out fail-over.

The Examiner states that Luke et al. teaches a system with NAS which supports NFS and TCP/IP. Even assuming that is the case, Luke et al. still does not disclose or suggest storing the data in a shared volume which is a storage region logically set on physical storage regions provided by the storage devices and which can be accessed commonly by any other channel control portion belonging to the same group to carry out fail-over, whereby a successor channel control portion belonging to the same group as a predecessor channel control portion takes over the IP address of the predecessor channel control portion to receive data that have been previously received by the predecessor channel control portion prior to failure thereof. Luke et al. also fails to disclose or suggest sending the data to another channel control portion belonging to the same group, through a network connecting the channel control portions to one another, to carry out fail-over, whereby the another channel control portion belonging to the same group as a predecessor channel control portion takes over the IP address of the predecessor channel control portion to receive data

Appl. No.: 10/649,100  
Amdt. dated: June 21, 2006  
Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited Procedure  
Examining Group 2113

PATENT

that have been previously received by the predecessor channel control portion prior to failure thereof.

For at least the foregoing reasons, independent claims 1-3 and 9-11, and dependent claims 4-8 and 12-16, are novel and patentable over Venkatesh et al. and Luke et al.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,



Chun-Pok Leung  
Reg. No. 41,405

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 650-326-2400  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
RL:rl  
60800325 v1